

FILE DESCRIPTION

SUBJECT

MEDFORD EVANS

FILE NO.

116-16338-14 EBF

116-16338-14



RECEIVED
JAN 10 1967
U.S. AIR MAIL
10c

RECEIVED
JAN 10 1967
U.S. AIR MAIL
10c



RECEIVED
JAN 10 1910
U.S. DEPT. OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF COMMERCE

RECEIVED
JAN 10 1910
U.S. DEPT. OF COMMERCE
BUREAU OF COMMERCE

AFFIDAVIT OF WEDFORD B. EVANS

IN APPEAL FROM ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION BY NORTHWESTERN STATE
COLLEGE TO TERMINATE APPLICANT'S EMPLOYMENT

STATE OF LOUISIANA
PARISH OF WABCHITTOCHES } ss.
CITY OF WABCHITTOCHES

TO THE HONORABLE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
STATE OF LOUISIANA
BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA

CLERK
1954
APR 5 1954
G.F.T.

I, Wedford B. Evans, Assistant Professor of Social Science,
Northwestern State College, Natchitoches, Louisiana, being duly
sworn in accordance with law, make the following statement in
the matter of the termination of my employment by Northwestern
State College (NSC). I contend, and hereinafter support the
contentions: (1) that in going about to separate me from the
Faculty of NSC the NSC Administration involved itself in and
committed improper actions, contrary to both the letter and the
spirit of State Board Policy; (2) that the decision to separate
me from the Faculty and terminate my employment was unjust and
injurious to me, and therefore ought to be set aside, so that
my employment may continue; and (3) that the motivating cause
of this improper and unjust decision has been shown to be so
powerful in operation and so obscure in origin that a full in-
vestigation ought to be made to determine whether there are
forces at work which may be injurious to the welfare of the peo-
ple of Louisiana, and which may endanger the peace and security
of the State of Louisiana. In support of these contentions I

Subtitle (1): NSC's Violation of State Board Policy

1. On or about March 1, 1958 I received a letter dated Febru-
ary 27, 1958, addressed to me from [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Northwestern State College, reading
in part as follows:

This is official notice that your application for leave of

b7c

absence for study during the fall semester of 1958-59 has been approved by the College administration. Under the Faculty Improvement Policy the College agrees to pay your regular salary for nine of the eighteen weeks of your leave.

It is understood that during the fall semester you are to do full-time work in the preparation of Chapter 14, a, 9., espionage, of a book entitled Facts on Communism, as outlined in your letter of December 4, 1957. It is understood that this work is to be done in and around Washington, D.C. and New York City....

After your project has been completed, please send me a concise statement showing the exact period of time covered and giving a brief summary of your achievements. Such a statement is necessary in the administration of State Board policy.

This recommendation of the college officials must, of course, be submitted for approval by the State Board of Education at its meeting on April 3, 1958....

2. The foregoing grew out of an application which I had filed December 4, 1957, in response to a memorandum dated November 20, 1957. [REDACTED] reading in part as follows:

...the faculty member desiring leave should go over his proposals with the head of his department and, after conference, should submit his proposed program in writing; next, the head of the department concerned should forward this application together with his recommendation to the dean of the school involved.

After all requests have been received, and the deans are thoroughly conversant with the situations in their respective schools, at least an initial decision should be made by the Deans' Council after all needs of the College have been canvassed and evaluated. Finally, the president shall pass upon the recommendations of the Deans' Council....

Each application will be given prompt and careful consideration....

It will be seen that the language of the foregoing memorandum presumes a situation where faculty members are to some degree in competition for approved leave with pay. The terms "application" and "request" are used; the instructions are addressed to "the faculty member desiring leave"; and assurance is given that "each application will be given prompt and careful consideration." It appears further that the competition is thought potentially serious enough to necessitate a rather elaborate procedure for evaluating and screening requests. Such an interpretation was confirmed for me by a conversation with [REDACTED] in

January or February 1958. He told me then that he thought he would be able to get the concurrence of the Deans' Council with his own tentative decision to grant me leave with pay (he did not know for just how many weeks), but that he was having some difficulty over the point whether the College ought to pay for work instigated by a Committee of the United States Congress. (Here he was referring to the fact that the book entitled Facts on Communism -- the book on which I was to work, as indicated in [REDACTED] letter quoted above -- was a project of the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives, and that it was the Staff of that Committee which had solicited my collaboration in preparing the Chapter on Espionage.) The nine weeks' leave with pay which I was eventually awarded meant a grant of approximately \$1600, an amount significantly above the average for such grants. Further, I had been at the College only three years, a period of service significantly below the average for recipients of such grants. It is understandable that the combination of factors -- (1) a felt reluctance to subsidize the Federal Government, (2) above-average financial cost, (3) below-average length of service on my part -- would have excited, as in fact it evidently did excite, some opposition within the Deans' Council to my being awarded this leave. Had it been thought in addition that plans were already contemplated or about to be drawn up involving my dismissal -- effective the very semester for which the leave under debate was being requested -- it is difficult to doubt that the opposition would have hardened almost invincibly. Indeed, it is difficult to believe that [REDACTED] had he then intended to let me go so promptly, would have insisted to his Deans' Council on granting me an award desired by and designed for permanent members of the Faculty. (Nevertheless, the possibility that he did already have such an intention should not be dismissed; it will need to be considered below when questions of method and motive are being examined.)

b7c

b7c

Letter of February 27, 1958 made and since it perfectly clear that leave of absence with pay was granted to an extensively pursuant to a Policy of the State Board of Education. [redacted] memorandum of November 20, 1957 carried as an attachment a copy of "A Policy for Improving the quality of Professional Services at the Colleges by Providing for Leaves of Absence with Pay for Faculty Members (Adopted by the Louisiana State Board of Education, January 18, 1946)," from which I quote the following:

The Louisiana State Board of Education will continue to seek the improvement of the quality of professional services at the colleges by requiring faculty members (all professional persons not under tenure) to take a leave of absence for a period of at least six weeks during every five years. All faculty members who have not met this requirement since September 1, 1946, shall be given until September 1, 1948 to meet it. Failure by a faculty member to meet this requirement shall result in forfeiture of tenure and eligibility for increase in salary or promotion is post until the requirement shall have been met.

From the preceding (the words are quoted exactly, but the understanding for emphasis is my own) it may be seen that the scope of the Policy is specifically limited to "all professional personnel under tenure." As further evidence of the Board's intent to limit the application of the Policy to permanent personnel, the policy prescribed for failure on the part of any faculty member to meet the requirements of the Policy involves "forfeiture of tenure," necessarily implying that such faculty member has tenure to forfeit. It is in any case of the essence of such a policy that it should apply to permanent faculty members, for the "improvement" sought necessarily follows the study and research done during the period of leave granted. To grant leave with pay to a temporary employee would be to frustrate the whole purpose of the Policy. The grant against such a result from an act of the employee himself, the Policy provides that:

In accepting a leave of absence with pay the faculty member shall be understood to assume a moral obligation to return to his institution for at least one year of further service unless specifically relieved of this obligation by his college president.

The allowance of the possibility that the college president may "relieve" the faculty member of his "obligation" is plainly intended as a concession to the faculty member, who may for his

67c

part unexpectedly desire to leave the college, as for a better job elsewhere, or the like. There is of course nothing in the Polley to preclude the possibility that the college president may for his part unexpectedly desire to terminate the services of the faculty member without having him return, but this would logically be for reasons arising after the leave had been granted. It cannot be the intent of the Polley that either the faculty member or the college president should agree to such leave, knowing in advance that the faculty member would not return to the college. To argue that when the letter of February 27, 1958 was sent to me there was any intent by the HBC Administration that I should not return in February 1959 for an indefinite period (but at least a year) would be to argue that there was a deliberate intent to violate State Board Polley. It is indeed patently arguable in any case that the letter of State Board Polley was violated when I was offered the leave, for it does not appear that I had tenure at the time the leave was offered. Against this charge there is a ready defense if it can be shown that when the leave was granted there was a firm intent to keep me until such time as I would have tenure. In that case the spirit if not the letter of the Polley would be preserved.

4. As matters now stand, it is hard to know what to think. [redacted] letter of February 27, 1958 stated that the College's recommendation to give me leave would be submitted to the State Board on April 3, 1958. There was not the slightest suggestion in the letter that the College intended to give the matter any further thought between February 27 and April 3. Indeed, the letter concluded politely, "I hope that you will find this period of research both pleasant and rewarding." April 3, 1958 was the beginning date of the Easter Holidays, which continued to the morning of April 8. Thus the calendar was set so that in the normal course of events I would receive notice of Board approval of my leave about the middle of April. Instead of that, on April 23 I was notified that my contract at HBC would not be renewed.

b7c

5. Here it is necessary to introduce the fact that in the meantime, before the meeting of the Board, I had, as was my right, voluntarily withdrawn my request for leave, on the ground that I had originally asked for eighteen weeks' leave with pay and had been offered nine, which was a fair enough counterproposal (as I then thought), but one which nevertheless I could not financially afford to accept, since a six weeks' grant in the summer would be more practical for me than a nine weeks' grant in the fall, and the time when I should be required (as I then thought) to take some amount of leave had not yet arrived. I set these considerations forth in a letter to [REDACTED] dated March 10, 1958. I did not expect and did not receive any reply, for none was necessary.

b7C

6. Was I terminated because I had refused the leave? If so, why was I never criticized for refusing the leave? I had a right to refuse it, and I explained fully my reasons, which were tacitly accepted. The NSC Administration has indicated that I was terminated because enrollment in my classes was meager and unpredictable, and because my academic background did not suit NSC's institutional needs. Such a judgment implies a careful and deliberate review of my record at NSC and analysis of my background in relation to NSC's institutional needs. Yet precisely such a review and analysis was not only made but argued over in the Deans' Council and the Office of the President when my request for leave was under consideration. That the general matter of background and needs was in the consciousness of the Deans and the President when they reviewed applications for leave is shown by the following statement from [REDACTED] memorandum of November 20, 1957 regarding "type of work contemplated": "In view of the needs of the graduate program, the last may in some cases require a somewhat detailed description of work completed in the past as well as that in prospect." If my enrollment and academic background as reviewed in February 1958 appeared unsatisfactory to the NSC Administration, I should never have been awarded leave with pay (for I certainly could not then claim it as a right). If new evidence came to light in March or April 1958 (the same semester), what was that new evi-

b7C

...ance, and when was it discussed? [redacted] has told me (I remind you that I am making this statement under oath) that he did not know of the plan to terminate me until April 10 or 12, 1958, and that it startled him when he heard it. [redacted]

It is almost incredible, and yet I believe it is true, that [redacted] did not know of the decision to terminate me more than ten days or two weeks before I did. He knew all about the decision to grant me leave, and participated in the review of my qualifications which led to that decision; but he said that he did not understand the reasons for the decision to terminate me, and that he did not participate in the original discussions leading to that decision.

7. I suggest that the NSC Administration is confronted with this dilemma: either I was considered to have tenure as of February 1958, or else I was not so considered. If the opinion was that I had tenure, when did this opinion change, and why? Or when did I forfeit the tenure, and why? It will be observed that what was alleged concerning my enrollment and academic background is irrelevant to the question of tenure. If the opinion was that I did not have tenure, why was I offered leave with pay under a State Board Policy explicitly applicable to "all professional personnel with tenure"? I suggest that a full explanation might reveal that when the leave with pay was offered to me, an intention had already been formed that I should never return. I have found no precedent for offering such a grant as I was offered to anyone with no greater length of service than I then had. I recall that when, following receipt of [redacted] memorandum of November 20, 1957, I broached to my [redacted] the matter of my applying for such leave -- diffidently calling to her attention my relative lack of seniority -- I was somewhat surprised that she encouraged me to go ahead and apply. I have already stated above that [redacted] encouraged me to hope for the award, and indicated that he was acting as a quasi-

advocate of my cause in arguments with and among the Deans. It will be understood that at the time I had no disposition to quarrel with [REDACTED] over the matter, for till April 23, 1958 I never thought that either of them was unfriendly or unfair, and in this case they seemed to be actively favoring my interest in a matter where I presumed their knowledge of correct procedure was superior to my own. Of course, when on April 23, 1958 both [REDACTED] revealed attitudes of hostility and evasiveness, I began an "agonizing reappraisal" of the realities of the situation. One thing and one thing only was consistent in their conduct from December 1957, when I was encouraged to apply for leave with pay, through April 1958, when I was told I was fired, and that was that throughout this period I was scheduled to leave the campus. To get rid of me -- willing or unwilling, friendly or hostile, with pay or without, the sooner the better and the more permanently the better, but in any event somehow -- that may well have been from some time in 1957 the one guiding principle in this whole affair. My point now is that if there was an attempt to get rid of me by first luring me out of town with a financial grant, then that attempt constituted a serious and contemptuous violation of State Board Policy. Obviously, I cannot prove conclusively that this was the case. There are two other possible alternatives. The first is that the grant of leave with pay was made frivolously, without due consideration -- in spite of conversation importing the contrary -- and thus was subject to an easy and possibly also frivolous reversal in a few weeks. This, too, would suggest an improper attitude toward State Board Policy. The other alternative is that at some time between March 10, 1958, when the offer was still in force and I declined it, and approximately April 10, when [REDACTED] first learned of the determination to get rid of me, some serious discovery was made relative to the desirability of my employment. This could not have been the alleged discovery that my enrollment and academic background were not satisfactory, for unless the action regarding the leave was frivolous, those matters had al-

ready been deliberated. But no other discovery has been suggested either to me or to the public by the NSC Administration.

Subtitle (2): Injustice and Injury to Affiant of NSC Decision

8. When [redacted] announced to me the morning of April 23, 1958 that my contract would not be renewed, I was shocked. I was shocked by the injustice of the decision, by the surprise of hearing it without any previous warning, and by the fact that [redacted] seemed to be shocked too. He had sent for me, and I had come to his office to find him and [redacted] waiting for me. While the Dean evidently knew what he was doing, he did not seem to know quite why he was doing it; there was some quality of bewilderment in his manner as he said to me: "Dr. Evans, this is the hardest thing I ever had to do, but I must tell you that your contract will not be renewed next year. [redacted] here will tell you why." He and I then turned to [redacted] who began a stony recital that seemed to last a long time, but said only that my enrollment was meager and unpredictable, and that my academic background was not suitable for anticipated needs. As a matter of fact, my enrollment was better than that of various colleagues, and my academic background was suitable for more than one need which NSC had and undoubtedly would continue to have, probably on an increasing scale, in the future. Yet it was not so much the falsity of the reasons alleged; it was not even the contradiction between this action and the so recently completed episode of the leave with pay. What was shocking was the abrupt reversal of an attitude that had been maintained for three years. I had not asked for the job at NSC; [redacted] had sought me out. During three years I had asked few favors, but I had received many. I was, to be frank about it, considered an "Administration man." One or two of my colleagues did not much like this, but I had no hesitation in admitting that in a perfectly legitimate way it was true. On numerous occasions I had said, "[redacted] is one [redacted] picked out of ten thousand." My reason for saying that was simple: I thought

b7C

b7C
b7C

b7C

b7C

b7C

that he was a political and economic conservative, that he was basically honest, that he wanted a sound educational program, and -- this is an anticlimax, I know, but it was important to me -- that he was a friend of mine. But as I listened to [REDACTED] on the morning of April 23, 1958, I knew that [REDACTED] was no friend of mine, for I knew that without his approval [REDACTED] would never have made this wooden effort to rationalize my dismissal. At this point it would seem useful to review my employment history at NSC, which accordingly I will do in the following paragraphs.

9. [REDACTED] telephoned me at my home in Dallas toward the last of May 1955 and asked me to come to Natchitoches for an interview. He had learned that I was leaving Facts Forum, an educational foundation supported by [REDACTED] who was, however, beginning its gradual liquidation. I went to Natchitoches the first Sunday in June 1955 and talked to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] offered me an appointment to teach two courses that summer, and in lieu of a third course (the normal summer teaching load is three courses) to give six public lectures in line with the anti-Communist campaign which I had been conducting at Facts Forum. For the nine weeks' appointment I was to receive \$1400. I accepted this offer. The College arranged for a good deal of publicity about my coming to NSC -- an extraordinary amount, I was later informed -- and about the public lectures I was to give against Communism.

10. In July [REDACTED] told me that he was pleased with my performance, and asked me if I would accept another temporary appointment, for the nine months beginning in September 1955. He explained that [REDACTED] was retiring, and that while he [REDACTED] understood that I was not an economics man he was sure that my general ability would enable me to teach economics for a year. After that, he intended to get a regular economics teacher, and might want to ask me to teach something else. I made sure that [REDACTED] understood that I

made no pretensions at being a regular economics teacher, that as a matter of fact I had never had even one academic course, graduate or undergraduate, in economics. True, I had been employed by the Federal Government for several years as an Organization and Methods Examiner (rising in that capacity to Grade GS-14), and as such had had a good deal of experience with the Federal Budget, with contract relationships, and with management practices in general. This, together with thirteen years' experience as a college classroom teacher, was the extent of my qualifications to teach economics. [REDACTED] made no secret of the fact that he did not much like the proposal made by [REDACTED] [REDACTED] however, insisted that he thought I could do the job, and I was willing to try. So an arrangement that was probationary on both sides was agreed upon. My salary was to be \$5600 for the nine months.

11. During that first year [REDACTED] gave me strong support. He arranged for me to be on the program at an economics meeting at SLI in Lafayette in December 1955. The paper I read there seemed to be well received. I was put on the NSC Assembly Committee, and on my recommendation the English anti-Communist (and ex-Communist) author [REDACTED] was secured to speak in Assembly. While certain faculty members objected to this, and it was decided to offset [REDACTED] possible conservative bias with a Texas college president thought to be a liberal, [REDACTED] expressed strong approval of my role in bringing [REDACTED] to NSC. [REDACTED] told me that whenever I had speaking engagements of my own I was to feel free to make arrangements for my classes, and to take a College car, provided only that I was to be introduced as an NSC faculty member. When I had engagements in Louisiana, I usually took him up on this, but when I went out of the state I went in my own car at my own expense. In March 1956 [REDACTED] called me into his office and told me that they were much pleased with my performance, and that he would like

her as to regard my appointment at HJG as permanent. I thanked him and said that I liked the College and the town of Hutchinsches very much, and that I would be glad to stay. It was agreed that I would not be asked to teach economics, but would teach history, contemporary international relations, and "Great Issues." The last, a course which [redacted] had taught himself, seemed to be of especial interest to him. It appeared that he thought that I had special qualifications to teach it. Following this, my wife and I began to regard Hutchinsches as our home. Besides the historic and aesthetic attractions which it has generally, it enticed us by being midway between [redacted]

and my birthplace, which is Austin, Texas. Impressed by the difference between rent in Hutchinsches and Dallas, we were in no rush to buy or build a house, but we put into the house and especially the yard where we lived (and still live) time and money that would not ordinarily be spent on a short-term rental. My wife formed a personal friendship with [redacted] and was asked by the latter to take an active part, and did take an active part, in the Hutchinsches Historical Tour. We had heard that Hutchinsches was socially aloof, but we did not find it so. We thought of it as a pleasant refuge from the competition of Dallas and the intrigues of Washington. Such was our impression.

12. Professionally, my acceptance at HJG seemed to be complete.

In the summer of 1956 I was asked to teach a graduate course in government, though this field is the specialty of another member of the department. My graduate classes every summer have been among the largest on the campus, and in the summer of 1957 the [redacted]

of the Graduate School specifically requested that the aforementioned government course be given again, and specifically that I be assigned to teach it, his request being based on reports and requests that had come to him from graduate students who had taken the course or who wanted to take it. I believe that as of today, by this way, I have been asked to serve, and have served, an more

b7c

b7c

b7c

advisory committees of individual graduate students than any other teacher in the Department of Social Sciences, perhaps more than any other teacher in the College outside the several Education departments. These requests normally originate with the students themselves. Beginning in September 1956 my salary for nine months was raised from \$5600 to \$6000. In October 1956 a faculty debate was held in Assembly on the then forthcoming Presidential election. [REDACTED] had made an extraordinary visit to a meeting of the Assembly Committee (of which I was a member) to promote this debate. I was charged with responsibility for organizing and participating in it. During the course of the debate I expressed strong segregationist views, which were well received by the audience, but not by all the faculty. In particular, two colleagues -- one in my own department, the other in the Department of Languages -- wrote and circulated libelous memoranda attacking me for my part in the debate. While I took note at the time that these memoranda were libelous, the general expressions of opinion by faculty, students, and town people (for the debate had been broadcast over the local radio) were so overwhelmingly favorable to me that I concluded, perhaps mistakenly, that no harm had been done to me, and did not press the issue. I was particularly reassured by a proper letter of rebuke written to one of my detractors by the Chairman of the Assembly Committee, and most particularly reassured when [REDACTED] to whom the other detractor appealed in a sequel of this dispute, vigorously and decisively supported me. I took this as further evidence of what I thought was a very friendly personal and professional relationship.

13. In the spring of 1957 I was invited to take part in a debate at Harvard University on the Oppenheimer case. Since my partner was to be a member of the Yale Faculty and our opponents two Boston attorneys, this was considered something of an honor, and [REDACTED] congratulated me profusely. He agreed readily to pay part of my travel expenses (the Athenaeum Club of Harvard was to pay the major portion), and in my presence at once called the NSC publicity director and told him forcefully to go all out in

b7c

publicizing this affair. The news of this debate was played up in newspapers throughout the state. On my return from Massachusetts, however, [redacted] did not seem to have time to hear from me a report on the debate, and he begged with me over the expense account which I submitted. This surprised me, as it seemed to be a reversal of his former attitude; but I knew he was indeed busy. I presumed he was in an economy-minded mood, and I dismissed the subject from my mind. Beginning in September 1957 my salary for nine months was raised from \$6000 to \$6350, where it stands now.

b7c

14. In the fall of 1957 I was asked by the Committee on Un-American Activities of the United States House of Representatives to be responsible for the chapter on "Espionage" in a projected encyclopedic work to be entitled "Facts on Communism." It was then thought that this work would be carried through during 1958. The appointment was for me an honor and an opportunity, but it did not carry any remuneration except an allowance for travel and reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses for supplies. It was shortly after this appointment that [redacted] alerted me to the faculty a copy of the State Board Policy on Faculty Improvement, as an attachment to his memorandum of November 20, 1957 regarding leaves of absence, with which I have dealt in some detail in Exhibit (1) above. At this point I will simply repeat that I applied for the maximum allowance, which is eighteen weeks' leave with pay; that my application was approved for nine weeks with pay, and nine without; and that thereupon I withdrew my request, and suggested that I might take a brief leave later. After this, it was a matter of six weeks till I was summoned to [redacted] office to hear the recitation by [redacted] of what have been called the "reasons" for my dismissal.

b7c

15. At that meeting in the Dean's office April 23, 1958 I pointed out at once the insubstantial character of the alleged "reasons" -- reminding [redacted] that my enrollment was higher than it had been in the fall of 1956 (at which time I had seemed to be in high favor) and that it was comparable to that of

certain colleagues. I pointed out that it was late in the year to be giving anybody notice, and I referred to the recent offer of leave with pay. [REDACTED] at once declared that it was not enough notice, and that he for one would vote to give me another year's contract if I wanted it. I thanked him and said I did want it. [REDACTED] at this point was mute, and I went to look for [REDACTED]. I got an appointment with him that afternoon. He said the whole thing was a matter of the budget, that he had put pressure on department heads to cut down on costs, and that [REDACTED] was the one who decided that the way for her to cut costs was to replace me. I reminded him that he personally had hired me, without any apparent worry about what [REDACTED] might think. I reminded him further that when I had been at NSC a year he had told me that as far as he was concerned I was permanent. I told him I knew he had to follow procedures, but that to this point he and I had actually dealt on a man-to-man basis. I reminded him that the College had just offered me leave with pay under a policy of the State Board intended to apply to permanent faculty members. He said he thought I was entitled to another year's contract if I wanted it. I said I did.

16. During the next five months several things happened that caused me to believe that the decision to terminate me might be reversed by the College. For one thing, members of the department were asked to submit a list of their publications. It was said that number and quality of publications might determine who would be retained, and would determine who would get a raise. I took this as a favorable sign, for my publications were more than all the rest of the department put together, and included articles indexed by the Public Affairs Information Service in their standard reference work, for which our library, like many others, pays a high subscription rate, showing that the judgment of the PAIS is thought to be valuable. For another thing, sixteen graduate students at Alexandria petitioned the College to send me to Alexandria in the fall (1958) to give again the extension course in "Great Issues" I had given there in the spring of 1957. The

b7C

b7C

b7C

College had not planned to repeat the course so soon, but hurried to the petition (which I believe was unprecedented) and the outcome was that eighteen students registered, while at the same time two other courses which it had been believed would be more in demand failed to materialize for want of enrollment. That is not intended by me as any criticism of the teachers of these courses, but it shows that any difficulty HEC may have had in predicting graduate enrollment has not been confined to my classes, and that at least this one case my enrollment was more, not less, than HEC had anticipated. It happened further that in the fall semester of 1958 my total enrollment was 30 per cent more than the enrollment of one of my colleagues. Finally, I knew that respected leaders in the state had requested [redacted] to do what he could to retain me, since my views on important social questions were widely known to coincide with those of the majority of the people of Louisiana -- which, I am sorry to say, is seldom true of Ivy League Ph.D.'s. [redacted] himself volunteered to me the information that he had been approached by a state leader in my behalf; he told me this in such a friendly manner that I thought surely the situation had changed in my favor.

17. It turned out I was wrong about that. In October I asked point blank if the decision to let me go had been reconsidered, and was told point blank, No. Then I got a letter from [redacted] dated October 13, 1958, reading in part as follows:

You will recall that on April 21, 1958, I informed you of an official decision to recommend that you not be reappointed to your present position for session 1958-59. At that time [redacted] explained to you the reasons for that decision. When you suggested that an additional year should be granted you, I readily agreed to the suggestion, for I fully recognized that the decision was given to you rather late. Your appointment was therefore removed for session 1958-59.

On the recommendation of [redacted] and with the approval of [redacted] I am now officially notifying you that you will not be recommended for reappointment after the close of the current long session--June 4, 1959.

So this I replied that the reasons given by [redacted] were not clear, and that I would like reasons in writing. Then I was called to a meeting with [redacted] [redacted] led off by saying that he could not give me reasons in

b7c

b7c

b7c

b7c

b7c

b7c

writing because the reasons were not his. [REDACTED] said that I did not have tenure, and therefore there was no need to give me reasons in writing. I said I realized I could not compel reasons in writing, but that for fuller understanding I could and did still request them. I referred to the matter of leave with pay, pointing out that had I taken it I would have presumably acquired tenure. I referred to my enrollment, which was not the least in the department, and to my publications, which were by far the most in the department. [REDACTED] specifically praised my publications, but repeated his determination to abide by what he said was [REDACTED] decision. He passed the job of giving the reasons again to [REDACTED] who repeated her performance of the preceding April, but with even less conviction, for in the meantime my enrollment had increased. [REDACTED] both said that it was customary to give leave with pay without reference to whether faculty members did or did not have tenure. I got no reasons in writing.

18. I have still never received any reasons in writing. I have, however, seen in the Shreveport Times a statement which [REDACTED] evidently gave to this Board on April 4, 1959, reading in part as follows:

Now that the Board has given at least preliminary consideration to the case of Dr. Evans, I have not the slightest hesitance in releasing the reasons given to me in a statement signed by the [REDACTED]

These reasons were given orally to Dr. Evans in April, 1958, and were confirmed in writing on Oct. 13, 1958. The "reasons" were NOT confirmed in writing on October 13, 1958, or at any other time; reference to [REDACTED] letter will show that he referred to the "reasons," but he certainly did not confirm them -- in fact, he carefully avoided even stating them....

The reasons given orally to Dr. Evans on April 23, 1958, stated that efforts to provide a satisfactory load for him had not been successful because of meager enrollment in courses for which he had proper academic preparation.

(2) Dr. Evans lacked the academic background to help us solve other institutional needs which had become increasingly pressing. We therefore could not provide a sound, dependable load for him and we needed to employ in his place a person with the required academic preparations.

(3) Enrollment in graduate students in on-campus and extension courses had proven especially unpredictable. This was contrary to our expectations when we employed him.

19. This is perhaps the time to analyze these alleged reasons on their merits, after which I will resume the narrative account of my case and bring it down to the present. Observe that it is not even alleged that I have not been satisfactory in the performance of my duties, unless it be thought that the allegation of "meager enrollment" constitutes a reflection on my performance. My enrollment compares favorably with that of others who teach advanced courses. At the time the letter of dismissal was written I had 131 students, while a recently promoted colleague had 100. My enrollment this semester is 116, which reputable colleges is considered a heavy load for a schedule consisting mostly of advanced courses. Let me say that my colleague's enrollment of 100, and the still smaller enrollments of various persons in other departments, are adequate to justify their positions, when they teach sufficiently advanced work. Number of students alone is not enough to measure a college teacher's work load. Nor is simply number of students together with number of semester hours. The type of courses taught and the number of different courses taught must be considered. I believe it will not be contradicted that in the four years I have been at NSC I have taught more different courses than anyone else in the department. Besides special seminars and thesis direction, I have taught seventeen different courses in four different subdepartments: Social Studies, Economics, Government, and History. Ten of the seventeen courses were advanced; i.e., above the sophomore level. At present, I have five different courses. I hope I may be forgiven the statement that I believe I have shown unusual flexibility and adaptability in meeting these extraordinary demands. The only time I have taught any course for which I did not have the "proper academic preparation" was my first year, when I taught economics at [REDACTED] request, in order, as I thought, to help the College over a temporary difficulty. I certainly did not imagine that this would later be used as a charge against me, either directly or by implication.

20. The case against me at this point begins to assume an air of the preposterous. Consider that in the summer of 1955 [REDACTED]

b7c

[redacted] was so eager to hire me that he did to some extent endanger his own academic reputation. At one time I believe [redacted] was concerned for fear I might not really have a Ph.D. from Yale. That turned out all right, for I do have one, but nobody in Hatchiteches knew it for sure when I went on the NSC payroll. Nor were there on hand any letters of recommendation, except one in my pocket from [redacted] for which I was never asked. I know the Dean was much relieved when finally he got letters from [redacted]

Admiral Lewis Strauss, then Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, that my employment record at all these places was good. What disturbed [redacted] most, however, was [redacted] insistence that it was all right for me to teach economics. And I must say I think some sympathy is due an academic dean who is asked to approve the appointment of a man he knows little about except that the man has never formally studied the courses he is being hired to teach. This obviously did not bother [redacted] and in the outcome it appears that [redacted] optimism about my ability to teach economics was justified, for I got along all right, and the students got along all right, and the learned meeting at SLI got along all right, and eventually I even published an article in the field of economics, entitled "What Is the National Debt?" which ran in two magazines -- one of them published by the Foundation for Economic Education at Irvington-on-Hudson, where the theory runs deep -- and this article too is indexed in the Public Affairs Information Service's select bibliography, and from the two magazines I got \$450 for the article. It was at the end of my year of teaching economics that [redacted] told me how pleased he was with my performance, and asked me to stay at NSC permanently. Still, it is true that economics is not my field. History is -- that is, it is one of my fields -- and it is ironic that after I had settled down and was teaching history, and [redacted] was satisfied that at last the academic proprieties were being observed, that [redacted] who had scarcely been

given time to say Yes, Sir! when [REDACTED] hired me, comes to the conclusion that the only way to save the HSC budget is to get rid of me, and [REDACTED] has no choice but to confirm her decision! Is it not plain why I have said, and say now, that [REDACTED] conduct in this matter can be explained only by supposing that he is under some kind of hidden pressure? He has said that the decision is basically [REDACTED] and he has pointedly referred to the published statement of "reasons" for my dismissal as being "signed by the [REDACTED]". Yet I was hired against [REDACTED] obvious wishes, and with only perfunctory attention to [REDACTED] -- who has never to this day interviewed me by herself on any serious subject. To imagine that either [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] caused [REDACTED] to decide to fire me is absurd. At the same time, it is true that he and I till this happened had been on very good terms personally. It follows that some person or persons not yet identified convinced him he had better get rid of me. And since the reasons given out are, as we are in the process of observing, so insane, it follows that the real reasons operating on the unidentified person or persons are also unidentified. Whoever the source of the pressure may be, I doubt whether he or they really care in the least if I point out in my defense such a fact as that History 204, Modern European, had 12 students when it was given to me in the spring of 1956, while it has 31 now, in the spring of 1959.

21. The statement that I lack academic background to help solve other institutional needs is so vague as to be almost meaningless, but it does raise questions as to what my academic background is, and what the institutional needs are. Interest in my academic background has shown up at HSC on a very curious schedule. For example, I have already told you how I was employed in the summer of 1955 before any transcript or certification or recommendation was on file. In contrast, I have now from the

b7c
b7c
b7c
b7c
b7c

University of Chattanooga a notice of the forwarding of my undergraduate transcript to [REDACTED] Northwestern State College, Natchitoches, Louisiana. The postmark on this notice reads, "April 10, 1959." That was six days after [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] statement to you that I lacked academic background to meet the institutional needs. Is it not remarkable that NSC should get my undergraduate transcript not only about four years after I was hired, but about a week after they told you they had fired me? Why do they want it now?

22. What is my academic background? I graduated from the University of Chattanooga with an A.B. degree in 1927 -- magna cum laude, at the top of my class. I had a major in English and three minors: French, history, and Greek. My last two years there I was Student Assistant in history, working for the famous historian now at the University of Virginia -- Thomas Perkins Abernethy. I taught my first college history class in 1925. I took my Ph.D. at Yale in 1933. I was in the English department. Yale did not have a system of labeled minors, but the English courses were conducted so as to require intensive study of philosophy and history, as well as passing three language exams: Latin, French, and German. My dissertation, written under the leading authority on the Eighteenth Century, Chauncy Brewster Tinker, concerned Dr. Samuel Johnson's Reports of Debates in the British Parliament in the 1740's, and was of course as much history as it was literature. My first teaching appointment after I got my doctorate was at the Texas College of Arts and Industries at Kingsville, Texas, where I was Associate Professor of History and English. My book The Secret War for the A-Bomb is listed in the American Historical Review and Foreign Affairs. It also is listed in the select bibliography of the Public Affairs Information Service.

23. I think it is customary in academic circles to consider publications as a qualifying factor. Sometimes the quality of the publications is considered. Here I confess to having been controversial. The philosopher James Burnham, who wrote the Introduction to my book, said that The Secret War for the A-Bomb

is, on the social, moral, and political implications of atomic energy, "not merely the best, but alone in its class." [REDACTED] wrote me in the fall of 1954: "Your book is to my mind the greatest yet written showing the success of the Communist conspiracy in the United States. It is also the most lucid on the moral, social and political attributes of the atomic energy development. It is altogether a great book." When asked if his statement might be used in promoting the book, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] wrote me at Facts Forum: "You may tell our mutual friend, [REDACTED] that I not only consent but will consider it an honor for him to distribute photostat copies of my letter with your book, The Secret War for the A-Bomb, which he is distributing....I never write a letter of the kind that I sent to you until I am completely convinced that my opinion is correct." In contrast with these favorable views of James Burnham [REDACTED] I must say that [REDACTED] the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, was so outraged by my book that he instigated a campaign to have James Burnham expelled from the American Committee for Cultural Freedom for having written the Introduction to The Secret War for the A-Bomb. This effort on behalf of free speech failed, and Burnham was not expelled. After winning the debate, however, Burnham voluntarily resigned. The non-Communist magazine The New Leader published an attack on me by [REDACTED] Graduate Department of Philosophy at New York University, and gave me space for a reply. They published my remarks, together with a rejoinder by [REDACTED] under the heading: Politics and the Atom Bomb, and Debate: Mortimer Evans & Sidney Hook. Evidence that my writings have had both support and opposition at high intellectual levels could be multiplied. When my article, An Open Letter to Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, appeared in National Review in 1957, I received a wholly unsolicited letter of commendation from a member of this Board at that time who is now in the United States Congress. He and I were not then personally acquainted. An article of mine on President Eisenhower's Atom-for-Peace proposals so impressed former Senator

John F. Brieker that he solicited my views on legislation then pending to amend the Atomic Energy Act. Senator Brieker, who was a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, wrote me a letter, which I have, stating that he had used my views in a speech on the floor of the Senate. I do not wish to boast, but why cannot a man whose work has been so recognized be used at NSC? What are the institutional needs? This whole affair has an element of mystery. I am reminded that the Shreveport Times published an editorial saying that one of my articles was the best they had ever read on the subject of the use of the atomic bomb against Japan in World War II. They published this about six weeks before they devoted their entire editorial section to a libelous editorial saying that "Hiring, not firing" was the mistake NSC made in my case. That happened to them!

24. I will not at this time go into evidence I have that the Shreveport Times got help from NSC in preparing the editorial. I will refer to their charge, once hinted at too by [REDACTED] that I have been a "rolling stone." Granted that since I became an articulate and aggressive anti-Communist I have had my troubles, I will simply point out that I taught at the University of Chattanooga eight years. One year I was voted the most popular faculty member on the campus, and every other year I was second. Also I worked on the atomic energy project eight years, first for the Tennessee Eastman Corporation and then directly for the Government, but essentially continuous employment, with numerous promotions. I entered the direct Government service as a GAF-9 Administrative Analyst in December 1945, and reached GS-15, Chief of Training, by February 1951. NSC has in my folder a letter dated July 13, 1955 [REDACTED] from Admiral Lewis L. Strauss, then Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, reading in part as follows:

Word has come to me that my friend, Mr. Medford Evans, formerly with the Atomic Energy Commission, now enjoys a visiting professorship in your institution and aspires to a permanent connection with Northwestern State College.

....Mr. Evans left the Commission voluntarily in March of 1952 and in good standing. The records of the Commission indicate that the reason for his resignation was in order to provide him with time to complete a book which he was writing

since, as a conscientious public servant, he did not feel that he could make a just division of his time between that pursuit and his Government work.

Shortly before I was promoted to the GS-15, Chief of Training, post, I received a rare "Meritorious Salary Increase" from AEC for my work as Acting Chief of the Organization and Methods Branch during a period of unusual stress.

25. The Shreveport Times published my denial of some false reports, the origin of which they refused to give, that I had been fired from the Deanship of McHurry College in Abilene, Texas. They also published a false statement that I declined to say why I left McHurry. I left McHurry because [REDACTED] offered me a much better job at Facts Forum, which I had told the Times. I have in my possession a copy of a very elaborate set of resolutions adopted at McHurry on my departure, constituting by far the most glowing tribute I have ever received. These resolutions, adorned with a gold seal, were signed by every officer of the College Administration and unanimously adopted by the faculty in a session called for the purpose. The Times also published my statement that [REDACTED] had dismissed me from Facts Forum, which is true, but is not thought prejudicial to me by those who know [REDACTED] who is a unique genius and does things in a unique way. I have, by the way, a complimentary letter of recommendation from him, and this, I understand, is something comparatively few people have. My wife, I might add, who also worked at Facts Forum, has an even better one.

b7c

b7c

26. [REDACTED] statement that "Enrollment in graduate students in on-campus and extension courses had proven especially unpredictable" is a prime example of appearing to say something without actually saying anything to the point. The implication seems to be that I do not have as many graduate students as HEC might reasonably expect me to have, but that is not said, and cannot truthfully be said. It is a matter of record and of common knowledge on the campus that I have had more graduate students by far than any other member of the Department of Social Sciences. What is the statement that my graduate enrollment

b7c

has proven unpredictable supposed to mean? Does it mean that with someone else in my place HSC could forecast graduate enrollment better? Such a contention would be absurd. Does the statement mean that HSC expected me to attract students on a nation-wide basis, or lure them away from LSU? It is not reasonable to expect such a thing of one teacher in a new graduate program. Does the statement mean, as one former student has facetiously suggested, that my enrollment has proven higher than was expected? On analysis it is impossible to say exactly what this third so-called "reason" does mean. But I will remind you that whatever it means was just as true on February 27, 1958 as it was on April 23, 1958.

27. After the letter of dismissal of October 13, 1958 and the conference with the [REDACTED] following, I still desired, if possible, a peaceful accommodation with the HSC Administration, and an opportunity to continue academic work on the campus. Accordingly, without waiving any rights that I might have to my position in the Department of Social Sciences, but being conditionally willing not to press these rights, I applied for a transfer to the Department of Languages. This application, which I made orally to [REDACTED] the morning of October 17, 1958, seemed to be received with friendly interest. The [REDACTED] said he would discuss the matter with [REDACTED]. My qualifications to teach English are thought to be even better than my qualifications to teach history. I have had more experience and more formal training in English; and while my more important publications have been in the field of contemporary history and public affairs, I have had literary and philological publications above the average for HSC. An article of mine published in American Speech in 1935 is cited in H.L. Mencken's monumental treatise The American Language; I have had poetry as well as prose published in the distinguished quarterly The Sewanee Review; and an article of mine in The Southwest Review in 1929 has been cited recently

b7C

b7C

as an early item in the body of scholarship accumulating about the life and works of William Faulkner. There had been some talk once before at HSC about the possibility of my teaching English, but so long as I did not realize how my position in the Department of Social Sciences had been undermined I preferred not to shift, for my concern with contemporary problems of Communist subversion fits perfectly into the plan of the course in "Great Issues," which [redacted] had seemed so anxious for me to teach, and in which I had apparently had such good success. But now that I was faced with flat hostility in the Department of Social Sciences, while [redacted] as well as [redacted] seemed friendly, it was only natural to reconsider and find attractive the possibility of teaching English. I know too that there would be a vacancy in the English department, for my wife had been a graduate student in English, and her adviser had told her that she (the adviser) was slated to retire. Here might be a solution to the whole problem. I had little enthusiasm for teaching Freshman English (no one has much), but the advanced courses in Shakespeare, Romanticism, and other special fields which I would presumably inherit from the retiring professor would fit perfectly both my training and my inclination.

25. During September and December I asked [redacted] several times what the decision was on my request for transfer. Always he replied that the final answer was not ready. The thing was possible -- it had a lot to recommend it -- but he had to do some more checking. He appeared to be much interested in how I would get along personally with my colleagues. He asked whether I would object to his questioning faculty members as to their judgment of the personal equation involved. I said of course I would not object. He and I agreed on a list of five persons of whom he was to make special inquiry. At a subsequent meeting he told me that most of the replies had been favorable to me, but that I would be surprised at one opinion he had heard. It was always recognized that the responsibility for the decision would be his and [redacted]

[redacted] At one time during these conversations -- of which

b7c

b7c

b7c

b7c

there were several, for I was increasingly anxious to get a definite answer -- he interrogated me about my views on the Russian Sputniks. The reason for this presumably was that I have something of a reputation for skepticism regarding Soviet scientific and technological achievements. About two years ago I published an article in Human Events questioning the scope and success of the Russian atomic energy project, and a year ago I published in National Review an article identifying material inconsistencies and other defects in the publicity on the Sputniks. (This article too was indexed by the Public Affairs Information Service.) I may observe in passing that my long-standing skepticism about Soviet nuclear missile capability seems to be rather fashionable in the Pentagon these days. [redacted] however, seemed to be somewhat upset because it had come to him that things I had said had caused certain students to doubt whether there are any Sputniks! That an academic dean should be disturbed by reports of an irreverent attitude toward the Sputnik is, abstractly considered, not without its amusing side; but this situation was not amusing. I furnished [redacted] with a copy of my article on the Sputnik, and I do not recall that he had anything further to say on the subject. In one of our conversations he asked me whether I intended, in case all else failed, to take my case to the Board. I replied that I certainly did so intend. He said that if I did he was afraid things would be said that I would be sorry to hear. I have never understood this remark.

29. In December [redacted] after a preliminary inquiry of me, asked my wife to come to his office, where he interviewed her regarding the possibility of her teaching Latin at HSO this semester we are in now -- Spring 1959. The reason was that the regular Latin teacher, who also teaches English, had received an offer to be visiting professor at the University of Michigan for one semester, and this was thought to be something of an honor for HSO as well as an opportunity for the professor. His English classes could be taken care of, but there was nobody who could

b7c

b7c

b7c

teach Latin, and it was known to [REDACTED] that my wife had been a Latin major at the University of Mississippi, where she did her undergraduate work. My wife and I both perhaps naively took this approach to her, occurring as it did when my own request was under active consideration, to be a very good woman. She said she would be glad to help out, and she received a letter dated December 19, 1958, notifying her of her appointment as a temporary, part-time instructor in Latin at a salary of \$500 for the semester, which was all right with her, since as she had explained she was not undertaking the work primarily for the money.

30. On January 14, 1959 I was told that my request for transfer to the Department of Languages had been turned down, on the ground that certain faculty members found me too sharp in argumentation, and that [REDACTED] and I did not have a relationship of mutual trust and confidence. Upon this, my wife withdrew her former acceptance of the offer to teach Latin, for reasons which she made plain in a letter to [REDACTED]

31. At first it seemed to me that this was the time to appeal the matter to the State Board of Education, for I thought the College had shut the last door in my face. I even prepared a preliminary notice of my intent to appeal. By ironic coincidence, it was in January that [REDACTED] asked members of the Departments of Social Sciences and Education to make a report on what we had done in courses toward teaching the facts of "Democracy vs. Communism." Since I had been accused of overdoing this subject, I made tentative plans to come to the Board with statements on both my anti-Communist teaching and the notification of my dismissal. I prepared and had mimeographed a memorandum to you dated February 2, 1959. However, a man in my situation never lacks for advisers. It had of course been necessary for me to start looking for some way to make a living after June 4, 1959, and I had therefore had to tell a number of people that I was being dismissed from NSC. The general level of discretion of these people was high, and the news did not get out much for quite a long time; still, a fair number of individuals knew it. Early in February

some friends of mine in North Louisiana held a meeting in Shreveport to discuss what they might do to help me. I told them of my memorandum to the Board, which I had ready to go, and they persuaded me that I should withhold it, on the ground that something could probably be worked out more quietly. I listened to them the more readily because I then had reason to believe that I would hear favorably any day from an extremely good job in the West for which I had been recommended by an influential person in public life. On this account, too, I asked certain friends in the Eastern part of the United States, who had become rather indignant at what they regarded as unfair treatment of me, not to make a public issue of the affair in the national press. From February 7, the date of this meeting in Shreveport, to March 24, was a time of superstitial calm in the case.

32. On March 24 I went to Bastrop, Louisiana, to speak before the Morehouse Parish Citizens' Council. The Publisher of the Bastrop Enterprise interviewed me in connection with my appearance there and in the course of the interview asked me whether it was true, as he had heard, that I had been dismissed by HSC. I said that it was true. By the way, I might interject here that [redacted] had told me in October that my departure would be called a resignation, and thus I would not be embarrassed. I replied that if I was fired I was going to say I had been fired. When the Bastrop publisher asked me flatly if the report that I had been dismissed was true, I told him flatly that it was true. When he asked me why HSC was dismissing me, I told him that had been said about enrollment and future needs, and told him I did not believe this was the real story, but that I did not know what the real story was. I mentioned speculation that it had to do with pressures in the integration matter, and speculation that it had to do with the Oppenheimer case. I had already discussed with him, in more than one interview with him and the publication of my book, the fact that I have been credited by some and debited by others with having been instrumental in producing a showdown on the Oppenheimer case. Following this interview, the publisher ran a speculative column about the Evans case in the Bastrop Enterprise.

b7c

The column appeared, I believe, March 25, though I did not see it for several days after that. On March 31 the Shreveport Journal published a story, which I still have not seen, though I have seen stories in other papers which were evidently copied or rewritten from it, giving a denial by HSC that my dismissal had anything to do with my views on segregation or my activities in support of states rights, as carried on in the Citizens' Council and the States Rights Party. I was told that the substance of this story was broadcast the same day -- March 31 -- over TV and radio. The next day several newspapers called me. I gave a statement referring to the change in HSC's attitude toward me between March 10 and April 23, 1958, mentioning that [REDACTED] and I had been on good terms till that time, and concluding that he must have been under hidden pressure to reverse himself so. I referred to speculation that pressure might have come from the NAAACP (this idea had been brought up in the Bastrop Enterprise), and said that such speculation is natural, which it is, but that I did not know where the pressure came from. I know that this statement of mine made [REDACTED] angry -- he told me that it was "beyond the pale"; but I will point out two things: first, my statement was true, and second, [REDACTED] is not trying to fire me because of that statement, for the statement was made about a year after the time when he evidently decided to try to fire me.

13. Throughout the first week in April there was a good deal of publicity about my case. But only one newspaper called me very often. That was the Shreveport Times, which called me six times altogether, twice in one day -- April 2. I was told by a confidential informant that the Times and the College were in communication, and I have some circumstantial evidence to support the statement of the confidential informant. On April 8 the Times ran a libelous editorial apparently aimed at depriving me not only of my job at HSC, but also of a chance to get a job at any college. This attack occupied the entire editorial section of the paper. It is amazing that one of the largest newspapers in the state should

b7c

b7c
b7c

attach so much importance to the case of an assistant professor.

34. Passing for the time being the conduct of the Shereport Times, the conduct of the HSC Administration in this matter has been outrageous. I was induced to come to the College, I was given every assurance that my work was appreciated and my position permanent, and then abruptly I was told that my services were no longer desired. The reasons alleged were so flimsy that no one would believe they were the real reasons -- thus every potential future employer would think there was some grave hidden fault in me which the College desired mercifully to conceal. I assure you there is nothing meretricious in what HSC is trying to do. Nor is there anything just. I appeal to this Board to overrule the decision of the HSC Administration and permit me to keep my job. I have been asked by friends why I want the job, considering what has happened. I want it because I have a moral right to it, because I can still do useful work in it, and because the hypocrisy of the reasons for this outrageous action ought to be exposed. I have numerous faults -- some of them no doubt serious -- but I am convinced that the real reasons for my dismissal at HSC are not my faults, but my positive accomplishments, the chief one of which is simply refusing to conform to the academic fashions of the day, refusing to parrot the clichés of the mass intellectuals. I have often heard [redacted] pride himself on his own refusal to run with the herd, and particularly on his resistance to propaganda of what he has called "unscriptural liberals." Yet the HSC decision in my case could not have been worse had it been given by the Warren Court.

b7c

Subtitled (3): Unanswered Questions in the Matter

35. Much of the material relative to this subtitled has already been introduced under Subtitled (2) above. The narrative of events given there has surely raised unanswered questions of motive. What can be the motivating cause of this improper and unjust decision -- at once so powerful in operation and so obscure in origin? This question is impossible to answer here and now. I hope that this

heard or other competent authority can make a full investigation, for I believe there are forces at work which are against the welfare of the people of Louisiana, and dangerous to the peace and security of the State.

36. Before offering some of my own speculations as to the effective cause back of this matter, I will refer to certain speculations which I believe are not true. In general, the class of explanations beginning with the remark, "Oh, it's just politics," seem to me wide of the mark, for these imply that what is at work is some familiar form of State politics, and I regard that as incredible, for the simple reason that I am not important in State politics. Any small degree of importance which I may have is the result of the publicity growing out of my dismissal -- which any reasonably smart politician would have known in advance, and therefore any politician who for some reason or other happened not to like me would certainly have let me die on the vine rather than cause my name to be in the papers as much as it was the first five days of April. What percentage of the voters of Louisiana ever heard of me before last month? Practically none. The individual graduate students and others who knew anything about me knew that most of my interests have little or nothing to do with Louisiana politics. The one exception is the matter of segregation. I am strong for segregation. Well, what politician in this state is not? Such as it be the Democratic National Committee. But I do not think he is back of this. I rather doubt that he knows who I am. Some people wish to blame Governor Long for everything, but I find it difficult to believe that the Governor has taken much interest in me one way or the other. I have not criticized him and he has not criticized me, though he and I are both rather outspoken individuals. Besides, I am on his staff. I am a member of the Advisory Committee on Nuclear Energy, appointed by Governor Long on the recommendation of [redacted] in the spring of 1954. Incidentally, that is another bit of evidence that [redacted] then thought of me as a permanent member of the NSG faculty. Granted that the Governor does not seem to have a high opinion of the

b7c

States Rights Party, of which I am a registered member, if he was thinking about the matter at all he would be the first to realize that this sort of hullabaloo helps the States Rights Party more than it hurts. But I will not try to tell the members of this Board that my case is not a typical one in Louisiana politics, for you know that much better than I do. In a sense, there is no doubt that we are here concerned with politics, but it is not Louisiana politics. This episode just happens to take place in Louisiana.

37. Here I want to tell you of an illustration of the peculiar obstinacy with which the NSC Administration has pursued this matter. In Paragraph 16 above I referred to the fact that respected leaders in the state made intercession for me with [REDACTED] last summer, and in Paragraph 31 I referred to a meeting held in Shreveport in February to consider what might be done in my behalf. I will now add that last fall one member of this Board showed his concern about this case, not about me personally, for he does not know me, but about issues that might be involved. At the same time an influential member of the Legislature acted as a friendly intermediary in the matter, conferring more than once with both [REDACTED] and myself, and at one time coming to believe that the affair was going to be straightened out, probably by going ahead with the transfer to the English department which I had requested. The good offices of all these people were engaged not because of any political importance of mine, for as I have said I do not really have any, but because they thought I had some academic importance. They all know that while all politicians in Louisiana are segregationists and for states rights, very few college teachers of social sciences are. Now remember that my job in itself is not very important -- I am just an assistant professor, the second lowest rank in the regular faculty. Here were numerous influential citizens showing concern that I be protected in that relatively unimportant job. Would it not be normal for a State College Administration to yield the doubt in my favor? Why risk antagonizing these people by insisting on firing an

b7c

b7c

ial is pure Shreveport Times, while much of the substance certainly comes from Northwestern State College. One more note in this connection: the Shreveport Times of April 3, in giving my employment history, in spite of getting several things wrong, gave one bit of information correctly which they did not get from me. Due simply to an oversight, I had forgotten to tell the State Editor that between my job at AEG and the one at McMurry I had been a free-lance writer and management consultant. Yet this item was published. I suppose they got it from whatever the State Editor was referring to when he told me on the phone, "It says here you were dismissed from McMurry."

39. It is a principle of mechanics that an effect is in proportion to its cause. When a building trembles we do not assume that a mouse ran through the basement. There have been some odd effects in this case, but nothing more striking than the fact that a [REDACTED] takes risks first to hire and then to fire an assistant professor, while a metropolitan daily fleuts the libel laws in a desperately overblown attempt to destroy the professional reputation of that assistant professor -- whom, incidentally, it had only a few weeks earlier singled out for praise and congratulation. These things do not come about because a State College cannot precisely forecast its graduate enrollment for next semester. The blows that have been aimed at me do not come from weak or lethargic sources. Somebody wants me punished, and is willing to go to a lot of trouble about it. I think there are comparatively few people in Louisiana who want me punished, and practically none who on their own initiative would be willing to go to any trouble about it.

40. You have heard the suggestion that maybe the NAACP wants to get me, and maybe it has some way to put pressure on the College. This is a natural speculation, and it may be true. An assistant professor of social sciences who belongs to the Citizens' Council is of some importance simply because he is such a rare bird. Sixty-six professors at LSU last year signed a petition of the Louisiana Civil Liberties Union (LCLU) against segregation. I doubt that you

b7c

dent.

McCarthy, of course, has been preparing an inquiry into "atomic security" for nearly a year....

Four days after taking office, Strauss ordered the removal from Dr. Oppenheimer's custody of classified documents pending a review of his security file....

The atomic scientists were aware that an attack was pending. The Fortune article suggested the main line it would take. More recently Medford Evans's book "Secret War for the A-Bomb" -- introduction by James Burnham -- laid the foundation. Here the whole "plot" is set forth. The atomic scientists quickly and accurately spotted the book as the opening barrage in a general campaign to discredit them. (Edward A. Shils' review of the book in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists for February, 1954, under the illuminating caption Conspiratorial Hallucinations, is must reading for those who want to understand the background of the Oppenheimer case.)

There is considerable nonsense in that piece of propaganda, but the editorial from which it comes leaves no doubt as to what the Nation thinks of me, or what it thinks of the importance of the Oppenheimer case. The review by Shils to which the Nation refers attacks my book as a work of paranoia. (It is a standard Communist gambit to label anti-Communists paranoids, witch-hunters, etc.) Shils is a social scientist at the University of Chicago. To illustrate the calm judicial temperament of Professor Shils I quote the following from the issue of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists appearing first after Oppenheimer had lost his clearance:

In its basic assumptions, the report of the majority of the Gray Board, which heard the Oppenheimer case, is of a piece with the harsher, more demagogic language of the savans who have alleged to take the safeguarding of our liberties into their custody the more effectively to subvert them. Its air of scruple and consideration circulates within an atmosphere blown out of the caves of the Dies, the Rankins, the Valdes, the Jenners, the McCarrans, and the McCarthys, who have come gradually to set the standard of judgment in American public life.

It used to be said that those who wrestle with pigs are bound to get dirty. The recent experience of the United States shows that those who frivolously permit themselves the luxury of allowing themselves to be led by pigs soon find themselves sliding desperately in the slimy mire created by their leaders. The damage done to Dr. Oppenheimer can scarcely ever be repaired. America's reputation as a free country governed by reasonable and courageous men -- already damaged in these past few years -- has further been damaged. It will take a very long time to recover our good name. But it is not too late for the American people and their leaders who believe that they are attached to our traditions, to bring to a halt their thoughtless drift toward an ignoble society. Let the American people, and above all their respectable conservative leaders, bethink themselves and take heed.

Now I believe it is clear that a man who writes like that feels a powerful urge. This man does not speak merely for himself. The

Oppenheimer's action group I was not buried deep enough.

44. I don't know that that is the true explanation. But I believe some extraordinary explanation will be required to explain the extraordinary facts that have occurred. And I believe the people of Louisiana have a right to know how far such an action group may have penetrated into the academic and business communities of the state.

45. It will be objected that I exaggerate my own importance in atomic politics, and that I am imagining things. I reply that it is not I who have exaggerated my importance in Louisiana politics, or in the segregation controversy. Rather, I have been the one to remind you that in Louisiana ^{Politics} I have no importance, and I have been the one to point out that in the segregation controversy I am a relative new-comer and relatively small fry. Nor is it I, in fact, who have been the one to say I am important in the history of atomic politics. It is the spokesmen of liberal thought who have identified me as a target. Finally, I remind you that I am not just imagining that I have been dismissed from my job. That is why you and I are here today.

Medford B. Evans
Medford B. Evans

STATE OF LOUISIANA:

PARISH OF HATCHITOCHES:

BEFORE ME the undersigned Notary Public in and for the State and Parish aforesaid, personally came and appeared Medford B. Evans, who, being by me first duly sworn, did depose and say, that:

The above and foregoing statements contained on 40 pages are true and correct and are made by him as under oath.

Medford B. Evans
Medford B. Evans

SWORN AND SUBSCRIBED before me this 5 day of May 1959.

Barry J. Thomas
Notary Public, Hatchitoches Parish, La.

May 19, 1959

VIA LIAISON

REC-60

116-16338-15

Honorable Lewis L. Strauss
The Secretary of Commerce
Washington, D. C.

Delivered 5-19-59
PFT

Dear Lewis:

In accordance with your request,
there is enclosed for your information a
Photostat of an affidavit of Dr. Medford B.
Evans entitled, "In Appeal From Administrative
Decision by Northwestern State College to
Terminate Affiant's Employment."

Sincerely,

Enclosure

PFT:kkn
(6)

NOTE: See cover memo Callan to Rosen dated 5/13/59 captioned,
"Dr. Medford Bryant Evans, Information Concerning," PFT:kkn.
Admiral Strauss has previously expressed an interest in
Dr. Evans and when informed by a liaison representative of
the Bureau that we had the affidavit referred to, he said he
would like a copy of same.

Tolson _____
Nichols _____
Boardman _____
Belmont _____
Mohr _____
Parsons _____
Rosen _____
Tamm _____
Trotter _____
Tele. Room _____
Holmes _____
Gandy _____

MAIL ROOM

MAY 25 1959

MAY 19 10 26 AM '59
FBI
RECORD-READING ROOM

RECEIVED

RECEIVED

b7c

PFT

Communism Will Fail, Soule Students Are Told

Students and faculty members of Soule college were told communism will fail but may destroy other forms of governments of the world before its own death.

Dr. Medford Evans, former professor at Northwestern State college, Natchitoches, and co-ordinator for Louisiana and Mississippi, likened communism to a parasite.

"And like other parasites," he said, "it will die when that which it feeds upon dies, if not before."

Like cancer, he said, it will spread if left unchecked—if no radiation is used to stop it. Worst Things to Do

"The worst thing we can do," he told the noon assembly of the business college yesterday, "is to surrender to communism."

"The second worst thing we can do is to attempt to negotiate."

Summit conferences are not the answer, he said. "Communism thrives on fraud and force. They reach their objective by lying and then by brutality." He called communism economic regression . . . "socialism in a hurry, armed with a gun."

Forces Its Plan

He said there exists in Russia a totalitarian state forcing its overall plan of production, defense and propaganda on the people.

He pointed out how this conflicts with the theory of a democracy in which the individual builds his future on hope . . . hope that by work he will be rewarded with a decent life.

Dr. Evans, introduced by George Soule, president of the school, offered one optimistic outlook to the New Orleans students.

He said New Orleans is a cultural city and like Washington would be spared by Russian aggression.

Immediate Targets

"Lake Charles and Shreveport, cities deep in the production of hydrogen which could be used in retaliation would be their immediate objectives," he said.

"This is the pattern of war and of aggression," he pointed out.

He congratulated the students of Soule, for their interest in education.

"Nothing is more needed today," he said, "than a revival in education. Never was there a country like the United States which today so superficially approved its lacking of the substance of education."

Mr. Tolson	_____
Mr. Mohr	_____
Mr. Parsons	_____
Mr. Belmont	_____
Mr. Callahan	_____
Mr. DeLoach	_____
Mr. Malone	_____
Mr. McGuire	_____
Mr. Rosen	_____
Mr. Tamm	_____
Mr. Trotter	_____
Mr. W.C. Sullivan	_____
Tele. Room	_____
Mr. Ingram	_____
Miss Gandy	_____

BAUMGARDNER

NEW ORLEANS STATES &
NEW ORLEANS ITEM
March 10, 1960
New Orleans, La.
NEW ORLEANS OFFICE

CP MATTERS

NOT RECORDED
17 MAR 17 1960

7 MAR 17 1960